

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

BECKLEY DIVISION

CHARLES IZAC,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 5:12-0613
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

On March 1, 2012, Petitioner, acting *pro se* and incarcerated at FCI Beckley, Beaver, West Virginia, filed an Application for Writ of *Habeas Corpus* by a Person in Federal Custody under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.¹ (Document No. 1.) In his Petition, Petitioner argues he was improperly “convicted of being a felon in possession of a firearm in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) and sentenced to one hundred eighty months due to the prosecutions finding under the Armed Career Offender provision.” (*Id.*, p. 1.) Petitioner claims he “is actually innocent of this enhancement under ACCA, as it was without merit and illegal under the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines.” (*Id.*) Petitioner explains that “[t]he court erred when it sentenced Mr. Izac as an Armed Career Offender based on the priors it found in his PSI, all of which were of burglaries of businesses and not considered violent because they were considered smash and grabs.” (*Id.*, p. 3.) Therefore, Petitioner contends that he “lacks the required predicate offenses to support an Armed Career Offender Enhancement and is therefore entitled to have his case vacated and remanded or whatever the Court deems adequate.” (*Id.*, p. 5.)

On May 16, 2012, Petitioner filed a “Motion to Remove 28 U.S.C. § 2241.” (Document No.

¹ Because Petitioner is acting *pro se*, the documents which he has filed in this case are held to a less stringent standard than if they were prepared by a lawyer, and therefore they are construed liberally. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972).

3.). Specifically, Petitioner “moves this Court to strike from the docket [his] motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 arguing illegal restraint pursuant to the actual innocence clause.” (Id.)

ANALYSIS

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i) provides that a petitioner may voluntarily dismiss an action without a Court Order by filing “a notice of dismissal before the opposing party serves either an answer or a motion for summary judgment[.]” Rule 41(a)(1)(B) states in pertinent part, as follows:

Unless the notice of dismissal or stipulation states otherwise, the dismissal is without prejudice. But if the plaintiff previously dismissed any federal – or state – court action based on or including the same claim, a notice of dismissal operates as an adjudication on the merits.

Rule 41(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that “[e]xcept as provided in Rule 41(a)(1), an action may be dismissed at the plaintiff’s request only by court order, on terms that the court considers proper.” The purpose of the Rule respecting voluntary dismissal “is freely to allow voluntary dismissals unless the parties will be unfairly prejudiced.” Davis v. USX Corp., 819 F.2d 1270, 1273 (4th Cir. 1987). “A plaintiff’s motion under Rule 41(a)(2) should not be denied absent substantial prejudice to the defendant.” Andes v. Versant Corp., 788 F.2d 1033, 1036 (4th Cir. 1986). It is well established that prejudice to the defendant does not result from the prospect of a second lawsuit. See Vosburgh v. Indemnity Ins. Co. of North America, 217 F.R.D. 384, 386 (S.D. W.Va. Sep. 12, 2003). In considering a Motion under Rule 41(a)(2), the District Court should consider the following relevant, but non-dispositive, factors: “(1) the opposing party’s effort and expense in preparing for trial; (2) excessive delay or lack of diligence on the part of the movant; (3) insufficient explanation of the need for a dismissal; and (4) the present stage of the litigation, i.e., whether a motion for summary judgment is pending.” Id.

Respondent has neither filed an Answer to Petitioner’s Section 2241 Application nor

otherwise pled. Accordingly, the undersigned respectfully recommends that Petitioner's Motion requesting voluntary dismissal of this action be viewed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A) and that the instant civil action be dismissed under Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i) without prejudice. See e.g., Camacho v. Mancuso, 53 F.3d 48, 51 (4th Cir. 1995)(Rule 41(a)(1) "only allows a unilateral dismissal prior to a defendant's filing an answer to the complaint or filing a motion for summary judgment.")

PROPOSAL AND RECOMMENDATION

The undersigned therefore hereby respectfully **PROPOSES** that the District Court confirm and accept the foregoing findings and **RECOMMENDS** that the District Court **GRANT** Petitioner's "Motion to Remove 28 U.S.C. § 2241" (Document No. 3.), **DISMISS** Petitioner's Section 2241 Application (Document No. 1.) without prejudice and remove this matter from the Court's docket.


Petitioner is hereby notified that this "Proposed Findings and Recommendation" is hereby **FILED**, and a copy will be submitted to the Honorable United States District Judge Irene C. Berger. Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(B), and Rule 6(e) and 72(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Petitioner shall have seventeen days (fourteen days, filing of objections and three days, mailing/service) from the date of filing of this Proposed Findings and Recommendation within which to file with the Clerk of this Court specific written objections identifying the portions of the Findings and Recommendation to which objection is made and the basis of such objection. Extension of this time period may be granted for good cause.

Failure to file written objections as set forth above shall constitute a waiver of de novo review by the District Court and a waiver of appellate review by the Circuit Court of Appeals. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 846 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94

(4th Cir. 1984). Copies of such objections shall be served on opposing parties, District Judge Berger and this Magistrate Judge.

The Clerk of this Court is directed to file this “Proposed Findings and Recommendation” and to mail a copy of the same to Petitioner, who is acting *pro se*.

Date: May 21, 2012.



R. Clarke VanDervort
United States Magistrate Judge